

# OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

77 South High Street, Room 1629

Columbus, Ohio 43266-0303

(614) 466-0880

CB 205

## APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

**NOTE:** Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application" for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

**APPLICANT NAME**  
**STREET**

City of Norwood

4645 Montgomery Road

**CITY/ZIP**

Norwood, Ohio

45212

**PROJECT NAME**  
**PROJECT TYPE**  
**TOTAL COST**

Roseland Mound Resurfacing

Roadway

\$ 25,718.00

**DISTRICT NUMBER**  
**COUNTY**

2

Hamilton

**PROJECT LOCATION ZIP CODE**

45212

This section to be completed by District Committee ONLY:

### DISTRICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

**AMOUNT OF REQUEST:** \$ 15,218.00

### FUNDING SOURCE (Check Only One):

☒

State Issue 2 District Allocation

State Issue 2 Small Government Funds

State Issue 2 Emergency Funds

Local Transportation Improvement Program

This section to be completed by OPWC ONLY:

**OPWC PROJECT NUMBER:**

**OPWC FUNDING AMOUNT:**

\$

# 1.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION

## 1.1 CONTACT PERSON

TITLE  
STREET

Mike Fraley

Engineering Dept.

3001 Harris Ave.

Norwood, Ohio

CITY/ZIP

45212

PHONE

( 513 ) 396 - 8183

FAX

( 513 ) 396 - 8177

## 1.2 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

TITLE  
STREET

Joseph E. Sanker

Mavor

4645 Montgomery Road

Norwood, Ohio

CITY/ZIP

45212

PHONE

( 513 ) 396 - 8150

FAX

( 513 ) 396 - 8177

## 1.3 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

TITLE  
STREET

Donnie R. Jones

Auditor

4645 Montgomery Rd.

Norwood, Ohio

CITY/ZIP

45212

PHONE

( 513 ) 396 - 8102

FAX

( 513 ) 396 - 8177

## 1.4 PROJECT MGR

TITLE  
STREET

Mike Fraley

Engineering Dept.

3001 Harris Ave.

Norwood, Ohio

CITY/ZIP

45212

PHONE

( 513 ) 396 - 8183

FAX

( 513 ) 396 - 8177

## 1.5 DISTRICT LIAISON

TITLE  
STREET

William Brayshaw

Deputy County Engineer

700 County Administration Building

138 East Court Street

CITY/ZIP

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

PHONE

( 513 ) 632 - 8523

FAX

( ) - -

## 2.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

	ESTIMATED START DATE	ESTIMATED COMPLETE DATE
2.1 ENGR. DESIGN	<u>    </u> / <u>    </u> / <u>    </u>	<u>COMPLETED</u> / <u>    </u>
2.2 BID PROCESS	<u>1</u> / <u>3</u> / <u>90</u>	<u>1</u> / <u>24</u> / <u>90</u>
2.3 CONSTRUCTION	<u>3</u> / <u>1</u> / <u>90</u>	<u>5</u> / <u>1</u> / <u>90</u>

## 3.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

3.1 PROJECT NAME: Roseland Mound Resurfacing

3.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### A. SPECIFIC LOCATION:

City of Norwood - Hamilton County  
North of Sheridan Drive (see attached map).

B. PROJECT COMPONENTS: The major components of the work to be done on this project are: 100% curb replacement, resurface with 2" asphaltic concrete, plane roadway, adjust utilities, construct new storm catch basins, and construct handicapped ramps for access.

### C. PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS:

Roseland Mound Project - 30 feet wide and 420 lineal feet of roadway. Bituminous concrete.

D. DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY: The current Roseland Mound roadway was constructed more than 30 years ago and is in need of rehabilitation. The roadway is currently 30' wide and provides 2 lanes of traffic and parking. The roadway is located in an area that has experienced very little growth in traffic volume or vehicle size/weight. The proposed roadway plans and specifications are designed to service the same traffic loads by volume and weight as the existing roadway.

### 3.3 REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Attach Pages. (Attached hereto please find site map and photos of project).

## 4.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

### 4.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS (Round to Nearest Dollar):

a)	Project Engineering Costs:	
	1. Preliminary Engineering	\$ -0-
	2. Final Design	\$ -0-
	3. Construction Supervision	\$ -0-
b)	Acquisition Expenses	
	1. Land	\$ -0-
	2. Right-of-Way	\$ -0-
c)	Construction Costs	\$ 25,718.00
d)	Equipment Costs	\$ -0-
e)	Other Direct Expenses	\$ -0-
f)	Contingencies	\$ -0-
g)	TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	\$ 25,718.00

4.2 TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT \$ 25,718.00

4.3 TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION \$ -0-

### 4.4 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES (Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

	Dollars	%
a)	Local In-Kind Contributions	\$ -0-
b)	Local Public Revenues	\$ -0-
c)	Local Private Revenues	\$ 10,500.00 40.82%
d)	Other Public Revenues	
	1. State of Ohio	\$ -0-
	2. Federal Programs	\$ -0-
e)	OPWC Funds	\$ 15,218.00 59.18%
f)	TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES	\$ 25,718.00 100%

### 4.5 STATUS OF FUNDS

Attach Documentation.

### 4.6 PREPAID ITEMS

Attach Page.

## 5.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

### The Applicant Certifies That:

As the official representative of the Applicant, the undersigned certifies: that he/she is legally empowered to represent the applicant in both requesting and accepting financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code; that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are a part of this application are true and correct; that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are a part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the Applicant; and, should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the Applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio law, including those involving minority business utilization, equal employment opportunity, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

Darrell Maxwell

Director, Public Service-Safety

Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

*[Signature]*

10/31/89

Signature/Date Signed

Applicant shall circle the appropriate response to the statements.  
In my project application, I have included the following:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO     | Two-year Maintenance of Local Effort Report as required in 164-1-12 of the Ohio Administrative Code.   |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO     | A registered professional engineer's estimate of useful life as required in 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code.  |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO     | A registered professional engineer's estimate of cost as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code.  |
| YES <input checked="" type="radio"/> NO                           | Two (2) copies of a 5-year Capital Improvements Report have been submitted to my District Integrating Committee as required in 164-1-31 of the Ohio Administrative Code. |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO     | A "status of funds" report per section 4.5 of this application.  |
| YES <input type="radio"/> NO <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A | A copy of the cooperative agreement (for projects involving more than one subdivision).  |
| YES <input type="radio"/> NO <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A | Copies of all warrants for those items identified as "pre-paid" in section 4.6 of this application.  |

## 6.0 DISTRICT COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION

The District Integrating Committee for District Number 2 Certifies That:

As the official representative of the District Public Works Integrating Committee, the undersigned hereby certifies: that this application for financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code has been duly selected by the appropriate body of the District Public Works Integrating Committee; that the project's selection was based entirely on an objective, District-oriented set of project evaluation criteria and selection methodology that are fully reflective of and in conformance with Ohio Revised Code Sections 164.05, 164.06, and 164.14, and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; and that the amount of financial assistance hereby recommended has been prudently derived in consideration of all other financial resources available to the project. As evidence of the District's due consideration of required project evaluation criteria, the results of this project's ratings under such criteria are attached to this application.

Donald C. Schæmm , Chairperson, Dist. 2 Integrating Committee

Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

*[Signature]* 11/25/90

Signature/Date Signed

CITY OF NORWOOD TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE  
OF LOCAL EFFORT REPORT

1988

- (1) Norwood Avenue - Resurfacing of 1,800 feet of Norwood Avenue. From the Community Development Block Grant Program Funds. \$62,477.00
- (2) Right of Way Easement - Obtained right of way from the Frisch's Corporation and the B & O Railroad for the bridge improvement on Montgomery Road. Funds were obtained from the Permissive Tax Fund. \$20,365.00
- (3) Improvement to Montgomery Road Bridge - Engineering and local match of improvements to bridge. Funds were obtained from the Permissive Tax Fund. \$202,722.00
- (4) Slurry Seal Project - crack sealing and improvement to various streets in Norwood. Funds were obtained from the General Fund. \$157,808.53

1989

- (1) Slurry Seal Project - Crack sealing and improvements to various streets in Norwood. Funds were taken from the General Fund. \$135,000.00
- (2) Repair to State Route 562 - Funds taken from the State Highway Fund. \$15,000.00
- (3) Repair to the concrete around Norwood City Hall - Funds taken from the General Fund. \$6,980.00
- (4) Replace the Air Conditioning at Norwood City Hall - Funds taken from the General Fund. \$7,000.00
- (5) Replace the roof at the Norwood Community Center - Funds obtained from the General Fund. \$5,000.00



JOSEPH E. SANKER, MAYOR  
*Department of Public Service - Safety*

PUBLIC WORKS  
3001 HARRIS AVENUE  
NORWOOD, OHIO 45212

DARRELL MAXWELL, DIRECTOR

DAN SULLIVAN  
PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR  
(513) 396-8180

October 16, 1989

Mr. Randall F. Howard  
Director, Ohio Public  
Works Commission  
77 South High Street  
Suite 1629  
Columbus, Ohio 43266

Re: City of Norwood, Ohio  
Resurfacing Project:  
Useful Life Requirements


Dear Mr. Howard:

In accordance with Section 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administration Code for Implementation of Issue 2 Infrastructure Program, I hereby certify that the Roseland Mound Resurfacing Project, has been designed in accordance with generally accepted engineering principles and practices within the State of Ohio taking into account the specific climate and other environmental conditions of the infrastructure's site as well as the infrastructure's full, anticipated design use loads. I also certify that the proposed improvements shall be constructed to provide a useful life expectancy of 10 years.

Sincerely,

Irvin P. Basler, P.E.P.S.

IPB/mn



*"Gem of The Highlands"*

## CITY OF NORWOOD

Engineer's Estimate

## PROJECT: RESURFACING ROSELAND MOUND


PAY ITEM	ODOT SPEC	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST QTY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL COST
1.	609	Type 3 concrete curb cast in place	L.F.	575	\$ 15.00	\$ 8,625.00
2.	609	Type 6 concrete curb cast in place	L.F.	210	15.00	3,150.00
3.	608	Concrete walks	S.F.	392	4.00	1,568.00
4.	Spec.	Driveway approaches removed and replaced	S.F.	312	5.00	1,560.00
5.	404	2" asphaltic concrete overlay	C.Y.	90	60.00	5,400.00
6.	407	Tack coat	S.Y.	1,577	.01	15.77
7.	604	M.S.D. manholes raised with brick and mortar	EA.	5	150.00	750.00
8.	604	M.S.D. manholes raised with shim rings	EA.	1	75.00	75.00
9.	604	City of Norwood manholes raised with brick and mortar	EA.	2	150.00	300.00
10.	604	City of Norwood manholes raised with shim rings	EA.	1	75.00	75.00
11.	254	Pavement planing	S.Y.	400	2.00	800.00



## Engineer's Estimate

PROJECT: RESURFACING ROSELAND MOUND

PAY ITEM	ODOT SPEC	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST QTY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL COST
12.	608	Type 2 curb ramp	EA.	1	\$ 400.00	\$ 400.00
13.	Spec.	Construct catch basins Standard construction drawings No 3A	EA.	2	1,500.00	3,000.00
					TOTAL	\$25,718.77



Approved as to legality and form.

By: Frances Sponzilli Loh  
Asst. Norwood Law Director

Date: 1-18-90

NORWOOD, OHIO

Resolution No. 1 1090

STATUS OF FUNDS REPORT

RESOLUTION OBLIGATING CITY OF NORWOOD  
FUNDS FOR ISSUE 2 PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Hamilton County Public Works Integrating Committee has approved the following Issue 2 projects for Norwood streets:

<u>Project</u>	<u>O.P.W.C.</u> <u>Funds</u>	<u>City of Norwood</u> <u>Funds</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mills Avenue	\$51,280.00	\$34,500.00	\$85,780.00
Drex Avenue	\$57,116.00	\$24,600.00	\$81,716.00
Roseland Mound	\$15,218.00	\$10,500.00	\$25,718.00
Weyer Avenue	\$11,473.00	\$ 5,500.00	\$16,973.00
TOTALS	\$135,087.00	\$75,100.00	\$210,187.00

WHEREAS, the City of Norwood must obligate its share in the amount of SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$75,100.00) in order to avail itself of the \$135,087.00 in state funds for those projects; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Norwood, State of Ohio:

That, by passage of this Resolution, this Council hereby obligates City of Norwood funds for its share of the above-listed Issue 2 Projects for Norwood streets in the amount of SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$75,100.00), THIRTY SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS (\$37,550.00) to be taken out of the STREET MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR FUND and THIRTY SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS (\$37,550.00) out of the PERMISSIVE TAX FUND.

PASSED 1-18-90  
Date

ATTEST Jane M. Grote  
Clerk of Council


Robert A. Whited  
President of Council

APPROVED 1-19-90  
Date

Joseph M. Smucker  
Mayor

ROSELAND MOUND  
ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT  
PROJECT - LOCATION AND LIMITS

JOSEPH  
M.  
POPULATION





ROSELAND MOUND

STATE OF OHIO

INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROGRAM

DISTRICT 2, HAMILTON COUNTY

PROJECT APPLICATION

Jurisdiction/Agency: City of Norwood Population (1980): 26,342

Project Title: Roseland Mound Resurfacing Project

Project Identification and Location: City of Norwood

Roseland Mound - Beginning at Sheridan Drive to End.

Type of Project: Rehabilitation ☒ Replace ☐ Betterment\* ☐

(Mark more than one box if there are expansion elements such as 2 lane bridge being replaced with a 4 lane bridge)

Explanation of Betterment Elements of Project\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Road ☒ Bridge ☐ Flood Control System (Stormwater) ☐  
Solid Waste Disposal Facilities ☐ Waste Water Treatment Systems ☐  
Storm Water and Sanitary Collection Storage & Treatment Facilities ☐  
Water Supply Systems ☐

Detailed Description of Project\*\*: Rehabilitation of existing roadway. Work  
to include: curb replacement, construction storm sewer inlets, adjust driveway  
and walks to grade as necessary, asphaltic concrete overlay, construct handi-  
capped ramps.

Type of Issue 2 Funds: District 2 ☒ Small Government ☐  
Water/Sewer Rotary ☐ Emergency ☐

\* See definition of Betterment attached.  
\*\* Attach additional sheets if necessary.

1. Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what percentage can be classified as being poor to very poor in condition, adequacy and/or serviceability.

Typical examples are:

Road percentage=  $\frac{\text{Miles of road that are poor to very poor}}{\text{Total mileage of road within jurisdiction}}$

Storm percentage=  $\frac{\text{Length of storm sewers that are poor to very poor}}{\text{Total length of storm sewer within jurisdiction}}$

Bridge percentage=  $\frac{\text{Number of bridges that are poor to very poor}}{\text{Number of bridges within jurisdiction}}$

40% or 24 miles of the City of Norwood's 60 miles of roadway are

in poor to very poor condition.

2. What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

Closed	_____	Fair to poor	_____
Extremely poor	_____	Fair	_____
Poor	<u>X</u>	Good	_____

■ Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge), surface type and width, structural condition of surface, substandard: berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, sanitary sewers, and water mains. List the age of the infrastructure to be repaired or replaced using one of the following categories: less than 20 years, 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, 50 years or older.

Age of pavement 20-29 years. Roadway has rutting, pot holes, poor

drainage, deteriorated or no curb.

3. If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months) after completion of the agreement with OPWC would the opening of bids occur? Three weeks.

■ Please indicate the current status of the project development by circling the appropriate answers below.

- a) Has the Consultant been selected?..... Yes No (N/A)
- b) Preliminary development or engineering completed? (Yes) No N/A
- c) Detailed construction plans completed?..... (Yes) No N/A
- d) All right-of-way acquired?..... Yes No (N/A)
- e) Utility coordination completed?..... Yes No N/A

To be coordinated during construction plan phase.

Give estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed. N/A

4. How will the proposed infrastructure activity impact the general health, welfare, and safety of the service area.

■ Where applicable, comment on the following:

a) Overall safety, including accident reduction (Accident records should be attached, if available).

b) Emergency vehicle response time (fire, police, & medical)

c) Other factors (i.e., fire protection, health hazards, etc.)

d) Additional User Costs - The additional distance and time for the users to travel a detour or an alternate route

e) When project is completed, how will it impact adjacent businesses?

5. Are matching funds available? (i.e. Federal, State, MRF, Local, etc.)

To what extent of anticipated construction cost? N/A

■ List the type and amount of funds being supplied by the local agency. This amount may be from local, Federal, State, Municipal Road Fund (MRF), or other sources. Explain additional funding through other sources being applied for or received for the project. Also, explain any need to accumulate funds for construction at a later date. Complete LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES on Page 6.

■ The local agency shall supply a minimum of 10% of the anticipated construction cost. Additionally, the local agency shall pay for all costs of engineering, inspection of construction, right-of-way, and the betterment portion of the project. Complete ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT, on Page 6.

6. Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial ban or complete ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? No.

■ Are there any roads or streets within the proposed project limits that have weight limits (partial ban) or truck restrictions (complete ban)? Have any bridges had weight limits imposed on them (partial ban) or truck prohibitions (complete ban)? Have the issuance of new Building permits been limited (partial ban) or halted (complete ban) because the existing storm/sanitary sewer or water supply system in a particular area is inadequate? Document with specific information explaining what type of ban currently exists and the agency that imposed the ban. No.

---

---

---

---

7. What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Use appropriate criteria such as households, traffic counts, ridership figures for public transit, daily users, etc., and equate to an equal measurement of users.

■ For roads and bridges, multiply current documented Average Daily Traffic by 1.2 occupants per car (I.T.E. estimated conversion factor) to determine users per day. Ridership figures for public transit must be documented. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by four (4) to determine the approximate number of users per day. Daily users  $420 \times 1.2 = 504$

---

---

---

---



Improvement Plan (that shall be updated annually) is attached or on file with the District 2 Integrating Committee for the current year or shall be submitted by March 31 of the program year. The Plan shall include the following:

- a) An inventory of existing capital improvements, including their condition,
- b) A plan that details capital improvements needs during the next five years and,
- c) A list of the political subdivision's priorities in addressing these needs.

The attached Form 1 shall be completed for those projects which are being submitted for Issue 2 funds.

9. Is the infrastructure to be improved part of a facility that has regional significance? (Number of jurisdictions served, size of service area, trip lengths or lengths of route, functional classification) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
N/A  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10.) ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ISSUE 2 FUNDS</u>	<u>LOCAL FUNDS</u>
Planning, Design, Engineering	(100% Local)	\$ N/A
Right-Of-Way/Real Property	(100% Local)	\$ N/A
Inspection of Construction	(100% Local)	\$ N/A
Construction and Contingencies	\$ 15,218.00	\$ 10,500.00
Betterment Portion	(100% Local)	\$ -0-
Subtotal	\$ 15,218.00	\$ 10,500.00 **
Grand Total (Issue 2 Funds Plus Local Funds).....		\$ 25,718.00

LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES

Municipal Road Fund (MRF)	\$ -0-
State Fuel & License Funds	\$ -0-
Local Road Taxes	\$ -0-
Local Bond or Operating Funds	\$ -0-
Misc. Funds (Specify) <u>City of Norwood</u>	\$ 10,500.00
Total Local Funds	\$ 10,500.00 **

\*\* These numbers must be identical

# LOCAL ABILITY TO PAY

## A. Previous Capital Budget For Infrastructure Projects\*

Budget is based on expenditures or appropriations?\* (Circle one)

	Funding (in thousands of dollars)	% of TOTAL expenditures/ appropriations	% of TOTAL Capital budget USED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIR/REPLACEMENT
	1986 \$ 4,213.50	.00045 %	.013 %
	1987 \$ 17,562.00	.0022 %	.1756 %
*1	1988 \$ 157,808.53	.0172 %	70.5 %
	1989 \$ 168,980.00 (est.)	.0194 %	33.80 %

## B. Projected Capital Budget For Infrastructure Projects\*

Budget is based on expenditures or appropriations?\* (Circle one)

	Funding (in thousands of dollars)	% of TOTAL expenditures/ appropriations	% of TOTAL Capital budget USED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIR/REPLACEMENT
	1990 \$ 310,000.00	.0345 %	62 %
*2	1991 \$ 460,000.00	.0345 %	62 %
	1992 \$ 310,000.00	.0345 %	62 %

\* Use only funds expended or appropriated for construction CONTRACTS.

Briefly explain any significant Reduction (10% or more) in projected expenditures or appropriations for 1989-92 as compared to actual expenditures or appropriations for previous years. (It is the intent of Issue 2 to SUPPLEMENT local capital funds, not REPLACE them.)

\*1 - In 1988, we spent \$62,477.00 of Community Development Block Grant Funds and \$202,722.00 from the Permissive Tax Fund for the bridge improvement; and \$20,365.00 from the Permissive Tax Fund for right-of-way easements.

\*2 - In addition to the normal year, the City is projecting to spend \$150,000.00 for the widening of Edwards Road.

Does the jurisdiction utilize any of the following methods for funding sources? (circle answer)


Local income tax.....	<u>Yes</u>	No
Permissive license plate fee.....	<u>Yes</u>	No
Bridge and road levies.....	Yes	<u>No</u>
Tax increment financing and/or..... capital improvement bond issues	Yes	<u>No</u>
Direct user fees.....	Yes	<u>No</u>
Permit fees and fines.....	Yes	<u>No</u>

### 13.) AUTHORIZATION

The applicant hereby affirms that local funds will be provided if this project is selected.

Note: Attach with application any photographs, reports, plans or other available data on the project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
4645 Montgomery Road, Norwood, OH 45212  
Address  
(513) 396-8101  
Phone (Work)

  
Signature  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darrell Maxwell  
Name  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Public Service-Safety  
Position  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City of Norwood  
Local Jurisdiction/Agency



ROSELAND MOUND

## DISTRICT 2

PROPOSED 5 YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
ISSUE 2 FUNDS ONLY

FORM 1 - 10-10-89

TYPE PROJECT  
(SUFFIX)

1. BRIDGE  
F.O.-FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE  
S.D.-STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT  
2. ROADWAY  
3. STORM WATER  
4. WASTE WATER  
5. WATER SUPPLY  
6. SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL  
7. FLOOD CONTROL

- A - REHABILITATION  
B - REPLACEMENT  
C - BETTERMENT


City of Norwood

NAME OF JURISDICTION/AGENCY

## IDENTIFICATION CODE

(See attachment 5)

PROJ. PRIORITY NO. IF FOR STAFF USED	PROJECT NAME	TYPE PROJ	PROJECT LOCATION, LIMITS OR BRIDGE NO.	CURRENT CONDITION IF FOR BRIDGES USE F.O. X 1.2) OR S.D.	DAILY USERS DAILY TRAFFIC P.E. AND R/W	TOTAL PROJECT COST INCLUDING P.E. AND R/W	ESTIMATED CONST. COST	IS CONST. FUNDED IN OVERALL 5 YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS I CAN PROJ. AMOUNT OF BE BID EARLIER FUNDS WITH ISSUE NEEDED AS 2 FUNDS % OF
FUNDING YEAR 1990									
1	Hills Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Montgomery to Allison	2420	\$ 85,780.00	\$ 85,780.00	Yes	Yes	59.78%
2	Hunter Ave.	2A	Ross Ave. to North	854	133,282.00	133,282.00		"	76%
3	Drex Ave.	2A	Carthage to Fenwick	732	81,716.00	81,716.00		"	69.90%
4	Roseland Hound	2A	Sheridan To End	504	25,718.00	25,718.00		"	59.18%
5	Weyer Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Beginning at Lowry to End	134	16,973.00	16,973.00		"	67.60%
FUNDING YEAR 1991									
1	Ida Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Beginning at Smith to End	864	68,260.00	68,260.00		"	67.27%
2	Poplar Ave.	2A	Beginning at Harris to End	114	24,925.00	24,925.00		"	75.93%
3	Norwood Ave.	2A	Beginning at Pine to End	5160	175,000.00	175,000.00		"	76.52%
4	Warren Ave.	2A	Dale to North	978	71,175.00	71,175.00		"	69.10%
5	Baker St. & Baker Circle Resurfacing	2A	Baker St. & Baker Circle	414	39,279.00	39,279.00		"	77.09%
FUNDING YEAR 1992									
1	Forest Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Williams to Smith Rd.	5400	154,653.00	154,653.00		"	68.97%
2	Harris Ave.	2A	Wesley to Forest	4320	47,578.00	47,578.00		"	72.68%
3	Section Ave.	2A	Wayne to Corp. Line	4860	77,494.00	77,494.00		"	74.20%
4	Harper Ave.	2A	Wesley to Linden Ave.	720	43,200.00	43,200.00		"	69.91%
5	Moundview Drive	2A	South of Indian Hound	512	65,500.00	65,500.00		"	78.63%
FUNDING YEAR 1993									
1	Warren Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Ross to North	978	73,013.00	73,013.00		"	65.50%
2	Park Ave.	2A	Smith Rd. to Beech	4200	142,400.00	142,400.00		"	71.92%
3	Hills Ave.	2A	Upper Millcrest to Allison	2412	43,900.00	43,900.00		"	72.67%
4	Rolston Ave.	2A	Ross to Wayne	936	46,620.00	46,620.00		"	72.12%
5	Highland Ave.	2A	Beech St. to Corp. Line	3000	65,000.00	65,000.00		"	70.77%
FUNDING YEAR 1994									
1	Floral Ave. Resurfacing	2A	Smith to Elmere	4860	293,371.00	293,371.00		"	81.94%
2	Forest Ave.	2A	Smith to Underpass	4620	82,847.00	82,847.00		"	75.86%
3	Grove Ave.	2A	Forest to Williams	2310	113,926.00	113,926.00		"	76.31%



JOSEPH E. SANKER, MAYOR

Department of Public Service - Safety

PUBLIC WORKS  
3001 HARRIS AVENUE  
NORWOOD, OHIO 45212

DARRELL MAXWELL, DIRECTOR

DAN SULLIVAN  
PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR  
(513) 396-8180

October 16, 1989

Mr. Randall F. Howard  
Director, Ohio Public  
Works Commission  
77 South High Street  
Suite 1629  
Columbus, Ohio 43266

Re: City of Norwood, Ohio  
Resurfacing Project:  
Engineer's Estimate

Dear Mr. Howard:


In accordance with section 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code for Implementation of Issue 2 Infrastructure Financing Program, I hereby certify that the following Engineer's Estimate (attached) for the \_\_\_\_\_  
Roseland Mound Resurfacing Project has been determined in accordance with generally accepted construction cost and practices within the State of Ohio taking into account the specific climate and other environmental conditions of the infrastructure's site, including prevailing wage requirements and other state/local requirements.

Sincerely,

Irvin P. Basler, P.E.P.S.

IPB/mn

Attachment (Estimate)



"Gem of The Highlands"

NOTE THAT THIS FORM IS BEING OFFERED FOR  
APPLYING JURISDICTION/AGENCIES: INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY. IT WILL BE  
FILLED OUT BY THE SUPPORT STAFF, BASED ON  
INFORMATION SUPPLIED ON APPLICATION FORMS.

OHIO'S INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROGRAM (ISSUE #2)

DISTRICT 2 - HAMILTON COUNTY

1990 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: City of Norwood  
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION: NOR 9004-2A  
Roseland Ave. Resurfacing - SHERIDAN TO N. TERM.

PROPOSED FUNDING:

57 % Issue 2 41 % LOCAL

ELIGIBLE CATEGORY:

59

POINTS

10

1. Type of Project

10 points - Bridge, road, storm water.  
3 points - All other type projects.

10

2. If Issue 2 Funds are awarded, how soon after the agreement with OPWC is completed would bids occur?

10 points - Will be let in 1990  
5 points - Likely to be let in 1990  
0 points - Not likely to be let in 1990



- 6
3. What is the condition and/or serviceability of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired. For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

10 points - Closed  
8 points - Extremely Poor  
6 points - Poor  
4 points - Fair to Poor  
2 points - Fair  
0 points - Good

- 2
4. Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what portion can be classified as being in poor to very poor in condition, and/or inadequate in service.

10 points - 50% and over  
8 points - 40% and over  
6 points - 30% and over  
4 points - 20% and over  
2 points - 10% and over

- 2
5. How important is the project to the health, welfare and safety of the public and the citizens of the district and/or the service area?

10 points - Significant importance  
8 points -  
6 points - Moderate importance  
4 points -  
2 points - Minimal importance

- 8
6. What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 20 points - Poor  
8 16 points -  
6 12 points - Fair  
4 8 points -  
2 4 points - Excellent

- 8
7. Are matching funds for this project available? (i.e., Federal, State, MRF, Local, etc.). To what extent of estimated construction cost?

10 points - More than 50%  
8 points - 40-50% and over  
6 points - 30-39% and over  
4 points - 20-29% and over  
2 points - 10-19% and over

- 0
8. Has any formal action by a Federal, State or local governmental agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? This includes reduced weight limits on bridges.

10 points - Complete ban  
5 points - Partial ban  
0 points - No action

- ~~1~~ /
9. What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project. Use appropriate criteria such as households, traffic count, public transit, daily users, etc. and equate to an equal measurement of persons.

5 points - Over 10,000  
4 points - Over 7,500 to 9,999  
3 points - Over 5,000 to 7,499  
2 points - Over 2,500 to 4,999  
1 points - Under 2,449

- 1
10. Does the infrastructure have regional impact? (May consider size of service area, trip length or total length of route, number of jurisdictions, functional classification, etc.)

5 points - Major impact  
4 points -  
3 points - Moderate impact  
2 points -  
1 points - Minimal impact

48  
~~48~~

TOTAL POINTS

TEAM 2 - CLINE & CAGBLE  
Reviewer Names

11/21/89  
Date